

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

November 17, 2010  
MAG Office, Saguaro Room  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Mayor Scott Smith, Mesa, Chair                          | Phil Matthews, Salt River Pima-Maricopa<br>Indian Community      |
| # Councilwoman Peggy Neely, Phoenix,<br>Vice Chair      | Mayor Jackie Meck, Buckeye                                       |
| # Mayor Bob Barrett, Peoria                             | Vice Mayor Les Presmyk, Gilbert                                  |
| # Stephen Beard, HDR Engineering, Inc.                  | # Mayor Marie Lopez Rogers, Avondale                             |
| * Dave Berry, Swift Transportation                      | # David Scholl   |
| * Jed Billings, FNF Construction                        | * Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale                                 |
| Councilmember Jack Sellers, Chandler                    | # Karrin Kunasek Taylor, DMB Properties                          |
| Councilmember Shana Ellis, Tempe                        | * Mayor Lyn Truitt, Surprise                                     |
| Councilmember Dick Esser, Cave Creek                    | Supervisor Max W. Wilson, Maricopa County                        |
| * Mark Killian, The Killian Company/Sunny<br>Mesa, Inc. | Victor Flores, State Transportation Board                        |
| # Mayor Jim Lane, Scottsdale                            | F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation<br>Oversight Committee |
- \* Not present  
# Participated by telephone conference call  
+ Participated by videoconference call

1. Call to Order

The meeting of the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) was called to order by Chair Scott Smith at 5:00 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chair Smith noted that Mayor Bob Barrett, Steve Beard, Mayor Jim Lane, Mayor Marie Lopez Rogers, and Karrin Kunasek Taylor were participating in the meeting by telephone.

Chair Smith thanked everyone for accommodating the meeting time change. He announced that on November 10, 2010, the Management Committee recommended approval of agenda item #4C, which was on the TPC consent agenda. He also noted that agenda item #7 was being deferred to a future meeting.

Chair Smith requested that members of the public fill out blue cards for Call to the Audience and yellow cards for consent or action items on the agenda, and then turn in the cards to staff, who will bring them to him. He stated that parking garage validation and transit tickets for those who used transit to attend the meeting were available from staff.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Smith stated that an opportunity is provided to the public to address the Transportation Policy Committee on items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. An opportunity is provided to comment on agenda items posted for action at the time the item is heard.

Chair Smith noted that no public comment cards had been turned in.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chair Smith stated that agenda items #4A, #4B, and #4C were on the consent agenda.

Chair Smith asked members if they would like to remove any of the consent agenda items or have a presentation. No requests were noted. Councilmember Esser moved to recommend approval of consent agenda items #4A, #4B, and #4C. Vice Mayor Presmyk seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

4A. Approval of the October 20, 2010, Meeting Minutes

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, approved the October 20, 2010, meeting minutes.

4B. Arterial Life Cycle Program Status Report

The Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) addresses ALCP project work, the remaining Fiscal Year 2011 ALCP schedule and program deadlines as well as revenues, and finances for the period between April 2010 and September 2010.

4C. Project Changes – Amendments and Administrative Modifications to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approval of amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update, and the FY 2009 and FY 2010 Program of Projects. On June 22, 2010, the MAG Transit Committee recommended approval of the FY 2009 and FY 2010 Program of Projects, and Regional Council took action on these changes on June 30, 2010. It was requested that eight earmark/high priority projects that were identified in the FY 2010 Federal Register be included in the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The Arizona Department of Transportation also requested to include new utility projects, an advancement and repayment for Williams Gateway Freeway, and to delete one project since it is complete. Maricopa County requested that a federal aid project is moved from 2010 to 2011, and the City of Tempe requested modification of a project description. On November 10, 2010, the Management Committee recommended approval of the requested changes.

5. Tempe South Locally Preferred Alternative

Wulf Grote, Director of Project Planning and Development at METRO, provided a presentation to the TPC on the Tempe South Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). He noted that Marc Soronson, the project manager of the consultant team, was also present to answer questions. Mr. Grote stated that METRO has been working on this project for almost three years. He indicated that the purpose of the presentation was to bring forth the staff recommendations through the policy process in order to apply for federal funding for this project.

Mr. Grote stated that when the study began, METRO was charged with studying a two-mile, high capacity transit project but pursued an expanded study area because they wanted to see how all of the transit components fit together in a larger context. Mr. Grote stated that the study area extends from downtown Tempe south to Loop 202 in west Chandler. He stated that within the study area are two projects that were identified in the Regional Transportation Plan funded by Proposition 400: the high capacity transit corridor extending from the light rail corridor in downtown Tempe to Southern Avenue, which is still funded, and the bus rapid transit (BRT) corridor on Rural Road on the south end from Chandler Boulevard north to Scottsdale. Mr. Grote stated that as a result of funding shortfalls, this BRT corridor has been delayed beyond the funding horizon of Proposition 400, although it is still included in the Regional Transportation Plan. He stated that due to the extensive amount of time they spent on the BRT project, they felt bringing forward recommendations was worthwhile.

Mr. Grote stated that an alternatives analysis was required in the federal process to define the transit technology and the route. He said that the study looked at the technologies of light rail transit, commuter rail, modern streetcar, and bus rapid transit, and potential alignments on Rural Road, McClintock, Mill Avenue, Kyrene Road, and the Tempe Branch of the Union Pacific Railroad.

Mr. Grote stated that the study concluded the recommended alternative as the Tempe South LPA was to implement a 2.6-mile modern streetcar project that would start in downtown Tempe in the northern end at Rio Salado Parkway, continue down Mill Avenue to the southern end at Southern Avenue.

Mr. Grote then addressed the recommendation for downtown Tempe. He said that initially, it was thought to have a route along Mill Avenue, but after several months of analysis, it was concluded that a better solution was to have an alignment northbound on Mill Avenue to Rio Salado Parkway to Ash and southbound to University. Mr. Grote stated that this alignment provides flexibility for special events, helps define downtown Tempe, provides opportunities for development and increasing capacity, and is the lowest cost alternative.

Mr. Grote stated that they initially studied an alignment between Mill Avenue and Rural Road on Southern Avenue, but realized there was no budget and it was beyond the two-mile parameter in the Regional Transportation Plan. Mr. Grote stated that they recommend this be included as a part of the project because it provides important connections to bus service and other accommodations, such as the Community Center and the library. He remarked that they can recommend this only as an illustrative project in the Regional Transportation Plan because there is no funding, and that it receive future consideration in the MAG process. Mr. Grote stated that upon further analysis and input, they recognized there is potential to extend the corridor south on Rural Road and east and west on Rio Salado Parkway and they also suggest that this be considered for future high capacity transit through the normal regional planning process.

Mr. Grote stated that the modern streetcar is different from light rail, even though they both operate with electrical power. He explained that a light rail car is typically more than 90 feet in length with multiple cars that operate in a dedicated lane, whereas the modern streetcar is about 65 feet in length, is a single car and operates in mixed traffic. Mr. Grote noted that the modern streetcar does not have the capacity of light rail, does not move at high speed, has more of a neighborhood feel and is to provide connectivity. He stated that the modern streetcar supports economic development solutions, is a lower cost alternative than light rail, and has simple stops, similar to the LINK service on Main Street in Mesa.

Mr. Grote stated that until the last couple of years, the federal government did not fund projects such as the modern streetcar, but seven or eight starter lines have received funding recently. He noted that they are part of the livable communities and sustainability discussion and strengthen metro areas.

Mr. Grote noted that ridership for the Tempe modern streetcar is estimated at approximately 1,100 to 1,500 per day. He noted that the initial ridership in the City of Portland, Oregon, was 3,000 per day and nine years later ridership has increased to 13,000; ridership on the 1.5 mile line in Seattle, Washington, has tripled from fewer than 1,000 riders per day to 3,000 per day.

Mr. Grote noted that the capital budget for the project is approximately \$160 million and is funded with Proposition 400 and federal funds (CMAQ and small starts). Mr. Grote explained that the operating and maintenance costs are estimated at \$3.6 million per year, and the operating costs for the modern streetcar

would be paid by the City of Tempe and the farebox. He advised that the Tempe City Council has made that commitment.

Mr. Grote stated that the modern streetcar is anticipated to increase transit ridership, connect neighborhoods to downtown Tempe and to neighborhood services, encourage redevelopment and reinvestment in downtown Tempe, promote a livable city community, provide seamless connection to light rail, and serve special events.

Mr. Grote addressed the Rural Road BRT option, which is not funded. He noted that the ridership projections are positive and it deserves further consideration in the MAG planning process. He indicated that METRO suggests service from downtown Tempe down Rural Road to two branches (one at Chandler Fashion Center and one at the Kyrene park and ride lot), ten minute service at peak times, stops approximately each mile, traffic signal prioritization and bus stop improvements, such as curbside bus and right turn lanes.

Mr. Grote stated that another option that arose from the study was the feasibility of commuter rail along the Tempe Branch of the Union Pacific Railroad. He advised that commuter rail was beyond the scope of the study, but they recommend that it continue to be considered further as part of the normal regional transportation planning process, and with no priority.

Mr. Grote stated that the Tempe South LPA has received the approval of the Tempe City Council, and recommendations from the Chandler Transportation Commission and Council Subcommittee, the MAG Management Committee, and the METRO Board that morning. He noted that upcoming actions are anticipated at the Chandler City Council and the MAG Regional Council. Mr. Grote noted that the intent is to make an application for federal funds for the next phase, which is project development.

Chair Smith thanked Mr. Grote for his report and asked members if they had questions.

Supervisor Wilson stated that Mr. Grote had reported that the lowest cost mode was selected and he asked for clarification of the cost. Mr. Grote replied that the total capital cost for the 2.6 mile modern streetcar project is approximately \$160 million.

Chair Smith noted that the region's cost for the project is approximately \$44 million from Proposition 400 funding.

Councilman Sellers stated that the City of Chandler is very involved in this process, but is disappointed that funding for the BRT on Rural Road was eliminated from the plan. He noted that studies show that this would be a very productive transit route. Councilman Sellers stated that the City of Chandler does not have sufficient funding and with the economy, is not expected to have any funding soon. He stated that the City of Chandler is not taking a position against the modern streetcar project, rather, it is anxious to see it succeed. Councilman Sellers stated that his comments were only to express frustration on how the overall system is planned and funded. He stated that the goal is to achieve a regional system, but with

the current practice, a substantial amount of sales tax funds will be used for projects with limited regional significance, rather than for a more integrated system. Councilman Sellers stated that Chandler supports the plan as it is, but is disappointed that the Chandler part is not what it desired. He asked if staff could provide ridership projections for the BRT on Rural Road.

Mr. Soronson replied that on the BRT element, ridership is projected to be 5,500 to 6,000 per day. He stated that there is also Route 72 service which operates at less frequency than BRT, and the idea is to have BRT operate every half mile on Rural Road with ten minute service to meet the FTA small starts criteria. Mr. Soronson stated that today, Route 72 stops every one-eighth mile with 30-minute service.

Vice Mayor Presmyk asked for clarification if these Proposition 400 funds were slated to a Tempe project and this was to move funds around. Mr. Grote replied that the funds for this project were part of the Proposition 400 plan and the study determined the route and mode for the corridor.

Mayor Lane asked for clarification that the recommendations were within the realm of what was originally approved in the plan. Mr. Grote replied that was correct. He explained that the Regional Transportation Plan included high capacity transit corridors and selecting a transit mode is a part of the federally required alternatives analysis process.

Mayor Lane asked about existing bus routes on this corridor. Mr. Soronson replied that an extensive analysis of bus routes in the south Tempe area is in process to optimize the bus/streetcar network and to match service in south Tempe with the City's financial capacity. He stated that there are two local bus routes on Mill Avenue – Route 65 and Route 66 – that are operated by the City of Tempe, and he noted that they would be significantly restructured. Mr. Soronson indicated that they are looking to better optimize the system and produce a better network.

Mayor Lane asked for confirmation that the bus routes would be restructured but not eliminated. Mr. Soronson replied that was correct. Mayor Lane stated the questions he had – about allocation of funds, integration of the streetcar with existing modes, and the proposal was within the initial realm – had been answered, and he noted that staff had done their homework.

Mayor Lane moved to recommend approval of: (1) A Locally Preferred Alternative for the Tempe South project, including a modern streetcar on a Mill Avenue alignment with a one-way loop in downtown Tempe to be incorporated into the MAG FY 2011 to FY 2015 Transportation Improvement Program and the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update for an air quality conformity analysis; (2) Inclusion of a potential future phase of modern streetcar east along Southern Avenue to Rural Road as an Illustrative Transit Corridor in the MAG Regional Transportation Plan; (3) Without modifying priorities in the Regional Transportation Plan, consider increased service levels and capital improvements for Rural Road BRT, per the description provided herein, through the regional transportation system planning process; (4) Future consideration for high capacity transit needs north of downtown Tempe along Rio Salado Parkway and south of Southern Avenue along Rural Road to the vicinity of Chandler Boulevard through the regional transportation system planning process; and (5) Without modifying priorities in the

Regional Transportation Plan, consider future commuter rail service along the Tempe Branch of the Union Pacific Railroad, through the regional transportation system planning process, and pending results from the Arizona Department of Transportation's Phoenix-Tucson Intercity Rail Alternatives Analysis. Councilmember Ellis seconded, and the motion passed with Mr. Beard abstaining.

6. Revised Sales Tax and Highway User Revenue Fund Projections

Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, updated members on the newly revised projections of the Proposition 400 sales tax and the Arizona Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF). He said that as a result of lower revenue projections the freeway program was balanced in October 2009, and approximately \$6.3 billion of projects were shifted to a new fifth year. Mr. Anderson advised that another effort to balance the program will be required based on the revised Proposition 400 and HURF forecasts.

Mr. Anderson displayed a chart of historical Proposition 400 sales tax collections through September 2010, and noted the negative growth in collections since September 2007. He noted that every month is a new record and he said there had never been a decline in sales tax revenue until September 2007. Mr. Anderson stated that in the first quarter of this fiscal year, the revenue collection was 3.7 percent lower than the first quarter one year ago. Mr. Anderson noted that there are some signs of economic recovery, such as the new Intel plant, but the sales tax continues to lag.

Mr. Anderson stated that the projected amount of sales tax revenue was estimated at approximately \$14.1 billion in 2003, and the revised forecast done cooperatively by MAG and ADOT dropped the amount to approximately \$8.7 billion, a reduction of \$5.4 billion, or 38 percent. Mr. Anderson showed a chart comparing the sales tax projections done in 2003 for the Regional Transportation Plan and the current sales tax projections for each fiscal year to 2025. He noted that the difference is widening all the time. Mr. Anderson stated that the projection for 2010 revenue done in 2003 was approximately \$450 million and the current collection amount in FY 2010 is \$299 million – one-third less revenue than projected. He stated that the projection for 2025 total revenue done in 2003 was approximately \$1.1 billion and the current forecast is approximately \$666 million.

Mr. Anderson stated that in the past, double digit growth occurred after economic recovery, and in Proposition 300, the original projections have been shown to be accurate. However, he thought double digit growth was not going to happen this time and he thought we are at a permanently lower base. Mr. Anderson stated that he did some simulations that assumed the economy returning faster and more robust than the revised projections and they indicated that another \$500 million would be picked up over the life of the sales tax, but the fact is, the collections are still running negative. He stated that putting out an optimistic forecast after three years of negative growth would not be prudent, and they are taking a conservative approach. Mr. Anderson remarked that projects can be added back in, but he thought the forecasts needed to be taken seriously.

Mr. Anderson then explained two charts of the composition of sales tax revenue. The first chart was done in 2005 for 2010 revenue and the second chart showed the actual sales tax collections. He pointed

that the 2005 figure for FY 2010 retail sales was approximately \$223 million and approximately \$143 million was collected. Mr. Anderson stated that a large element of sales tax collection is motor vehicle sales. He noted that contracting was projected at more than \$60 million in revenue for 2010 and approximately \$30 million was collected. Mr. Anderson added that the only positive sector was utilities due to higher prices.

Mr. Anderson displayed a chart of motor vehicle taxable sales for July of each year, 2004 through 2010, and noted that the amount peaked in 2005 and 2006, at approximately \$750 million for each of those years. Mr. Anderson noted that the amount for 2010 was approximately \$380 million, about half of the peak rate. He remarked that motor vehicle sales and contracting are the weaker sectors of sales tax sources.

Mr. Anderson showed a comparison of sales tax growth rates and said that some cities are projecting some rebound for FY 2011, but many cities show low rates of growth.

Mr. Anderson showed a chart of HURF projections to 2020. He stated that HURF is a significant amount of funding for the highway program. Mr. Anderson explained that HURF is composed of about one-half gas tax revenue, 20-25 percent of vehicle license tax, and the remainder of registration fees and miscellaneous revenues. Mr. Anderson noted that actual collections for 2008, 2009, and 2010 were significantly below projections, and ADOT is forecasting lower levels and slower growth through 2020, which tracks with the national trends. He reported that economists he has spoken to think there will be a longer recovery period. Mr. Anderson indicated that Elliott Pollock has indicated recovery in 2013 or 2014, but he thought it could be 2014 or 2015.

Mr. Anderson stated that the change in the sales tax forecast from last year of \$2.2 billion means an impact to the highway program of \$1.2 billion and to transit of \$735 million. He reported that the freeway program bonding levels supported by the sales tax are down \$650 million over the life of the program, however, there are savings on debt service because payments will not be needed on debt not incurred. Mr. Anderson pointed out a net reduction to the highway program of approximately \$600 million, and he said that savings of approximately \$700 million may be targeted to allow for flexibility moving forward.

Chair Smith thanked Mr. Anderson for his report and asked members if they had questions.

Mr. Arnett asked for clarification that the contingency amount built in to the Plan in 2003 was now gone. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct; when the highway program was balanced to cut \$6.5 billion, all the program contingencies were taken to zero. He noted that there are contingency amounts for some projects for design work, but most of the built in program contingencies are now gone.

Mr. Arnett stated that there may be a Proposition 500 someday and he asked if any thought had been given to the approach to the voters to instill confidence besides saying that the economy went bad. Mr. Anderson replied that yes, what to tell the voters has been discussed, but the story about foreclosures and unemployment is universal across the state and the region. He stated that this situation is reminiscent of

the 1980s, but then, not much attention was given to either the cost or revenue side of the freeway program and it took the performance audit in 1991 to put management practices in place that resulted in better performance on the system. Mr. Anderson stated that staff took the lessons learned and when the revenue trends began to change in 2007, they reported to the TPC on the steps that would need to be taken. He stated that in economic downturns, Arizona is typically the first to be affected due to its rapid growth, but usually emerges quickly. Mr. Anderson remarked that he did not think this will happen again due to the housing market. He stated that he thought going back to the voters needed to be contemplated, and finding another revenue source besides the sales tax, which has served the region well, could broaden the revenue base.

Chair Smith stated that he would like to see how the charts play out in ten years. Mr. Anderson noted that he still has the Proposition 300 handwritten ledger sheets.

7. Transit Prioritization Guidelines for Federal Funds

This agenda item was not heard.

8. Input on Business Representatives on the Transportation Policy Committee

Dennis Smith, MAG Executive Director, presented a report on this item. He said that when the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) was formed in 2002, it included six business representatives: one who represented construction interests, one who represented transit interests, one who represented freight interests, and three who represented regionwide business interests. Mr. Smith stated that with the passage of Proposition 400, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives were authorized to each appoint three business members to serve six year terms on the TPC.

Mr. Smith noted that State law also provides that the Chairman of the Regional Planning Agency may submit names to the President and Speaker for consideration, although the decisions are ultimately those of the President and Speaker. He stated that on December 31, 2010, the terms of two of the TPC business members will expire: Steve Beard, the transit representative, and David Scholl, one of the regionwide business representatives. Mr. Smith referenced the two letters submitted that were included in the agenda packet: one from Mr. Beard, who indicated his interest in continuing on the committee as the transit representative, and one from Vice Chair Peggy Neely, who recommended Garrett Newland, Vice President of Westcor for the regionwide business representative. He noted that Mr. Beard had discussions with RPTA. Mr. Smith added that before this meeting, past TPC minutes were consulted, and sometimes the TPC took action to make a recommendation and sometimes it has not taken action.

Chair Smith asked members if there were any comments.

Mr. Arnett stated that he thought both representatives were good recommendations and he made a motion to move forward their names to the Regional Council. Vice Chair Neely seconded. The vote on the motion passed, with Mr. Beard abstaining.

9. Legislative Update

Nathan Pryor, MAG Intergovernmental Policy Coordinator, provided an update on legislative issues of interest. Mr. Pryor stated that recently awarded federal grants have included the HUD Sustainable Communities Challenge Grant, the HUD Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant, TIGER I, TIGER II, and the Federal Railroad Administration High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Grant. He noted that the MAG region did not receive any of these awards.

Mr. Pryor stated that the Kaiser Family State Health Facts reports that Arizona has the third highest foreclosure rate, the 12th highest unemployment change rate (tied), and is 28th in food stamp change rank. Mr. Pryor noted that overall, Arizona is the eighth highest nationally for distress.

Mr. Pryor noted that nationally, approximately \$4.6 billion was awarded through federal grants and he then reviewed the five states that received the highest amounts: California, \$1,093,679,036; Florida, \$856,598,250; Iowa, \$256,663,000; Michigan, \$235,428,006; Illinois: \$165,713,424. He pointed out that Iowa, which does not have a large population, received much of its grant funding due to the potential high speed rail connection to Chicago.

Mr. Pryor gave a comparison of Arizona, which nationally received \$64.3 million. He noted that Arizona is 14th in population, 14th in funding awards, and 28th in per capita funding. Mr. Pryor stated that the MAG region did not receive direct funding through the federal grants he mentioned at the beginning of his presentation, and he noted that this is a limited look and does not include any potential energy or health and human services awards.

Mr. Pryor then provided a breakdown of the \$64.3 million in grants received in the state of Arizona by saying that Tucson received \$63 million for the modern streetcar, a joint effort of Apache and Navajo Counties and three tribes received \$820,000 for the HUD Sustainability grant (also applied for by MAG); and \$500,000 of \$1 million received by the Western High Speed Rail Alliance to be shared with California and Nevada.

Mr. Pryor stated that grant activities will continue to be monitored as they are released. He stated that a debriefing on the Sustainability grant is scheduled with HUD in an effort to learn about strengthening future applications. Mr. Pryor stated that MAG is considering applying for an upcoming HUD/Ford Foundation grant. He displayed a map that showed the jurisdictions that received federal grants in 2010 and he pointed out that a predominant number were awarded in the eastern part of the country. Mr. Pryor stated that with a new Congress, there might be movement from earmark funding to more formula based funding. He stated a complete analysis of grant awards to all 50 states and the District of Columbia was available and he offered to provide this information if requested.

Chair Smith thanked Mr. Pryor for his report and asked members if they had questions.

Mayor Rogers asked the reason the MAG region was not awarded the HUD Sustainability grant. Mr. Pryor replied that MAG staff has a debriefing session with HUD scheduled which they hope will provide information on how future applications can be improved.

Mr. Arnett commented that an overlay of blue states and red states to the map might be interesting. Mr. Smith stated that staff had already done that analysis.

10. Request for Future Agenda Items

Topics or issues of interest that the Transportation Policy Committee would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting were requested.

No requests were noted.

11. Comments from the Committee

An opportunity was provided for Transportation Policy Committee members to present a brief summary of current events. The Transportation Policy Committee is not allowed to propose, discuss, deliberate or take action at the meeting on any matter in the summary, unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

No comments from the Committee were noted.

Adjournment

It was moved by Councilman Esser and seconded by Councilman Sellers to adjourn the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

---

Chair

---

Secretary